UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,163	08/21/2003	Hui-Ling Lou	MP0284	1606
FISH & RICHA	7590 12/14/2007 ARDSON	EXAMINER		
3300 DAIN RA	USCHER PLAZA	NGUYEN, HANH N		
60 SOUTH SIXTH STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		2616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
•		10/647,163	LOU ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Hanh Nguyen	2616		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Donsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>American</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under Expression 1.	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati 9)⊠ 10)⊠	Claim(s) 1-3,5-27,29-51,53-75 and 77-104 is/a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-3,5-27,29-51,53-75 and 77-104 is/a Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 13 September 2007 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	wn from consideration. re rejected. r election requirement. r. are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is object	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
	•	arimor, roto tro attaorioa Omoo	7,000,000,000,000,000		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some color None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
2) D Notic 3) D Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate		

Art Unit: 2616

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claim 73, it is required that "an information carrier" that embodies "a computer program product" be a physical hardware such as a computer readable memory storing the computer program product. In addition, Examiner believes "a computer program product" is not described in the specification.

Claims 74, 75, 77-96, 103 and 104 are also rejected because they depend on claim 73 respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-27, 29-51, 53-75, 77-104 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadous (US Pat. 6,996,195 B2).

*In claims 1, 7, 8, 25, 31, 32, 49, 73, 79, 80, Kadous discloses a method of obtaining channel estimates (see Abstract; channel estimation using OFDM) comprising receiving a preamble across a channel, the preamble including two or more training sequences (see fig. 1, col.4, lines 50-65; receiver 100 receives a signal r(t) over a radio channel. The signal comprises

Art Unit: 2616

training sequences [A,B] and [C,D] transmitted from antennas Tx1 and Tx2; see col.5, lines 30-55, Further in fig.5, the training sequences are extracted from preamble of data burst; see col.9, lines 55-60); performing a Fourier transform of the training sequences (see fig.1A, col.4, line 60 to col.5, line 5; FFT 34 converts the signal from time domain to frequency domain); deriving initial channel estimates in the frequency domain with the received preamble and a stored preamble (see fig.2; col.5, lines 15-20; channel estimator 36 receives frequency domain signal and determine channel estimation with a stored training sequence in buffer 54(fig.2)); receiving data symbols across the channel (see fig.1, col.5, lines 35-40; the received training sequences of length N inherently include data symbols as being well-known in the art); demodulating and decoding the data symbols (see fig.1; col.4, lines 50-65 and col.5, lines 10-12; demodulator 44 and decoder 50 demodulates the signal to reproduce the orginal signal).

Kadous does not disclose updating the channel estimate using the demodulated and decoded data symbols. Since it is not specifically described how the claimed "updating the channel estimation" is performed, therefore, "updating the channel estimation" is broadly understood as "repeating the channel estimation" after demodulating, decoding the data symbols

Chuang et al. discloses updating the channel estimate using the demodulated and decoded data symbols (see fig.1A, col.2, lines 5-20; at receiver 140, transformed signal after being demodulated, decoded is fed back to channel estimator 165 which repeats the signal channel estimations, demodulations and decode). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art apply the teachings of Chuang et al. into Kadous to update the demodulated and decoded

Art Unit: 2616

data symbol by using channel estimation. The motivation is improve channel quality such as minimize error rate of received data symbol.

In claims 18, 42, 90, Kadous disclose that the data symbol is decoded using Viterbi algorithm (see fig.1, Viterbi decoder 50).

In claims 2, 17, 26, 50, 74, the limitation has been disclosed in claim 1 (See claim 1, Chuang et al. fig.1A, receiver 140).

In claims 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 43, 45, 46, 48, 91, 93, 95, 97, Kadous disclose exponential update, least mean square update (see fig.2, least mean square estimator 56).

In claim 41, the limitation of this claim has been addressed in claim 1.

In claims 98-104, Kadous does not explicitly disclose the channel estimation is compliant with IEEE 802.11a, IEEE 802.16a. But the OFDM channel estimation of Kadous is inherent to be compliant to IEEE 802.11, 802.16a.

In claim 11, kadous discloses interpolation channel estimation (see fig.1, interpolator 60).

claims 5, 6, 9-16, 23, 27, 29-51, 53-72, 75-78, 81-89 are also rejected due to their dependency to parent claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Crawford (US Pat. 6650616 B2);

Ojard et al. (US Pat. 6,892,075 B2);

Cho et al. (US pat. 7068593 B2).

Art Unit: 2616

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-27, 29-51, 53-75 and 77-104 have

Page 5

been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hanh Nguyen whose telephone number is 571 272 3092. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 to 4:30. The examiner can

also be reached on alternate

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Lynn Field, can be reached on 571 272 2092. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hanh Nguyen

HANH NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER